



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tom. *Ellis v. Ohio Life Ins. & T. Co.*, 4 Oh. St. 628. The recognition of a custom under the circumstances of the instant case would seem warranted by analogy. And as to the endorsement, while one line of authority looks upon it as no guarantee to the drawee, but only to subsequent endorsers, another line is to the contrary, and considers it as affecting the drawee. *Ford v. People's Bank of Orangeburg*, 74 S. C. 180. A rule following the equities would seem to be the better.

BILLS AND NOTES—WHAT IS EVIDENCE OF DELIVERY UNDER PLEA OF NON EST FACTUM?—In an action against a decedent's estate on a promissory note, the administrator interposed a plea of non est factum, thus throwing upon the plaintiff the burden of proving the execution of the note. After proof of the signing of the note, it was offered in evidence. After the plaintiff rested his case, the defendant requested a directed verdict on the ground that the plaintiff had not made out a *prima facie* case. The plaintiff's motion was refused. On error, the question was what proof is necessary to make a *prima facie* case of delivery. *Held*, proof of signing, coupled with possession of the instrument, is sufficient. *Deeter v. Burk* (Indiana, 1915), 107 N. E. 304.

As execution is composed of the two elements of signing and delivering, and the plea of non est factum compels the plaintiff to prove execution, the proof of both signing and delivery is necessary. Some decisions, even in the state of the instant case, are to the effect that proof of signing, though coupled with actual possession, is not sufficient evidence of delivery. *Digan v. Mandel*, 167 Ind. 586; *Purviance v. Jones*, 120 Ind. 162; *Sears v. Daly*, 43 Ore. 346. The instant case adopts a contrary view which is also supported by certain Indiana decisions, *Brooks v. Allen*, 62 Ind. 401; *Taylor v. Gay*, 6 Blackf. 150. The theory in support of the doctrine of the instant case is that with the signing proved, and possession had, the inference must then be either that the maker did deliver the instrument, or that the holder came into possession of it wrongfully; that the presumption must be in favor of right conduct, and therefore that situation warrants the finding of delivery. This rule it was considered tended to promote the facility of commercial intercourse through the medium of negotiable instruments.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—ANTI-ALIEN LABOR STATUTE.—A statute of Arizona (enacted under the initiative provision of the constitution of that state) required employers of more than five laborers to include in that number at least eighty per cent of qualified electors or native-born citizens of the United States; *held*, such a statute is unconstitutional as denying aliens the equal protection of the laws. *Truax, et al. v. Raich* (1915), 36 Sup. Ct. 7.

The question was raised upon a bill in equity by an employee who had been threatened with discharge from employment because of the employer's fear of the penalties of the statute. The employment of the complainant was at the will of the parties; and the bill was filed before any proceedings had been begun against the employer for the violation of the statute. The employer, county attorney and attorney general were made defendants. The